



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,078	12/09/2003	Takashi Kitaguchi	245488US-2CONT	2771
22850	7590	08/09/2007		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, LUONG TRUNG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/09/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/730,078	Applicant(s) KITAGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner LUONG T. NGUYEN	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/337,400.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/03,09/04,08/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35

U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 09/337,400, filed on 06/22/1999.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-5, 10-11 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, 9-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,686,954. Although

Art Unit: 2622

the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-5, 10-11 of the instant application are broader in every aspect than the patent claims 1-5, 9-10, and are therefore obvious variants thereof.

Application claim 1 is encompassed by patent claim 1.

Application claim 2 is encompassed by patent claim 2.

Application claim 3 is encompassed by patent claim 3.

Application claim 4 is encompassed by patent claim 4.

Application claim 5 is encompassed by patent claim 5.

Application claim 10 is encompassed by patent claim 9.

Application claim 11 is encompassed by patent claim 10.

4. Claims 6-8 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,686,954 in view of Namerikawa et al. (US 6,089,090).

Regarding application claim 6, patent claim 1 does not disclose wherein the quantity of rotation represents a rotation caused by a shaking motion of the digital camera. However, Namerikawa et al. teaches that a gyro sensor, which detects the angular velocity of rotation (quantity of rotation), is used for picture blurring-preventive systems of VTR camera (column 1, lines 5 – 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the patent claim 1 by the teaching of Namerikawa et al. in order to detect the angular velocity of rotation.

Regarding application claim 7, patent claims 1-2 does not disclose wherein the quantity of rotation represents a rotation caused by a shaking motion of the digital camera. However, Namerikawa et al. teaches that a gyro sensor, which detects the angular velocity of rotation (quantity of rotation), is used for picture blurring-preventive systems of VTR camera (column 1, lines 5 – 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the patent claims 1-2 by the teaching of Namerikawa et al. in order to detects the angular velocity of rotation.

Regarding application claim 8, patent claim 1 does not disclose wherein the rotation detecting unit comprises a gyro. However, Namerikawa et al. teaches that a gyro sensor, which detects the angular velocity of rotation is used for picture blurring-preventive systems of VTR camera (column 1, lines 5 – 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the patent claim 1 by the teaching of Namerikawa et al. in order to detect the angular velocity of rotation.

5. Claim 9 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,686,954 in view of Hasegawa (US 5,900,927).

Regarding application claim 9, patent claims 1-2 does not disclose wherein the translation detecting unit comprises a range finder. However, Hasegawa teaches a range finder is mounted on a camera for measuring the distance to a subject. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2622

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the patent claims 1-2 by the teaching of Hasegawa in order to measure distance to a subject.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Goton et al. (US 4,713,697).

Okazaki (US 5,649,237).

Naganuma (US 5,959,666).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUONG T. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-7315. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DAVID L. OMETZ can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LN
08/05/07



LUONG T. NGUYEN
PATENT EXAMINER